

1
2
3
4 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
5 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
6 AT TACOMA

7 RICHARD D. YORK,

8 Petitioner,

v.

9 MAGGIE MILER-STOUT,

10 Respondent.

No. C09-5513 RBL/KLS

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION
Noted for: October 23, 2009

This case has been referred to Magistrate Judge Karen L. Strombom pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Local MJR 3 and 4. Petitioner is an inmate at the Airway Heights Correction Center (AHCC). He has filed a petition for writ of *habeas corpus* pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254 and an application to proceed *in forma pauperis*. Dkt. 1. Because Petitioner appears to have sufficient funds with which to pay the \$5.00 court filing fee, the undersigned recommends the Court deny the application.

DISCUSSION

A district court may permit indigent litigants to proceed in forma pauperis upon completion of a proper affidavit of indigency. See 28 U.S.C. §1915(a). However, the court has broad discretion in denying an application to proceed in forma pauperis. *Weller v. Dickson*, 314 F.2d 598 (9th Cir. 1963), cert. denied, 375 U.S. 845 (1963).

Several district courts have ruled that denial of *in forma pauperis* status is not unreasonable when a prisoner is able to pay the initial expenses required to commence a lawsuit. See *Temple v. Ellerthorpe*, 586 F.Supp. 848 (D.R.I. 1984); *Braden v. Estelle*, 428 F.Supp. 595 (S.D.Tex. 1977); *U.S. ex rel. Irons v. Com. of Pa.*, 407 F.Supp. 746 (M.D.Pa. 1976); *Shimabuku*

¹ *v. Britton*, 357 F.Supp. 825 (D.Kan. 1973), *aff'd*, 503 F.2d 38 (10th Cir. 1974); *Ward v. Werner*, 61 F.R.D. 639 (M.D.Pa. 1974).

3 By requesting the Court to proceed *in forma pauperis*, Petitioner is asking the
4 government to incur the filing fee because he allegedly is unable to afford the costs necessary to
5 proceed with his petition for *habeas corpus*. Petitioner's application reflects that he is employed
6 at AHCC and earns \$50.00 per month and that he has an average spendable balance of \$86.26.
7 Dkt. 1, pp. 1 and 3. The undersigned recognizes that the funds to which Petitioner has access
8 may not be great. However, given the fact that a prisoner's basic needs are provided for while he
9 is incarcerated and the minimal filing fee required to proceed with this action (\$5.00), it is not
10 unreasonable to expect Petitioner to pay that fee from those funds.

CONCLUSION

Because Petitioner appears to have sufficient funds to pay the filing fee, the undersigned recommends that the Court deny his application to proceed *in forma pauperis*.

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Rule 72(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure (“Fed. R. Civ. P.”), Petitioner shall have ten (10) days from service of this Report and Recommendation to file written objections thereto. See also Fed. R. Civ. P. 6. Failure to file objections will result in a waiver of those objections for purposes of appeal. *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985). Accommodating the time limit imposed by Rule 72(b), the clerk is directed set this matter for consideration on **October 23, 2009**, as noted in the caption.

DATED this 5th day of October, 2009.

Karen L. Strombom
Karen L. Strombom
United States Magistrate Judge